

## REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6, 9, 11-14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Siwinski, Pub. No. 202/0186214. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Siwinski in view of Applicant's admitted prior art (see Specification, page 1, lines 29-30). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In accordance with claim 1, the present invention requires the use of pixels of an OLED display device having a plurality of OLEDs for emitting different colors of light specifying a gamut and at least one additional OLED for emitting a color of light within the gamut defined by the other OLEDs. Further in accordance with claim 1, a display driver is employed for receiving a color display signal representing a relative luminance and color to be produced for each pixel of the display and generating a converted color display signal for driving the OLEDs in the display at the relative luminance and color, wherein the display driver is responsive to a control signal for controlling the in-gamut mixing ratio of the OLEDs to reduce power consumption or increase lifetime of at least one of the OLEDs. As described at page 6, lines 10+, the term "in-gamut mixing ratio" refers to the ratio of light produced by the in-gamut OLED to light produced by the gamut-defining OLEDs, and thus relates to use of such in-gamut OLED and gamut-defining OLEDs in combination to produce in-gamut colors. To further define such feature, claim 1 has been amended in accordance with such description to explain that the display driver drives the OLEDs in the display with the converted color display signal to produce in-gamut colors using a combination of light from the in-gamut OLED and light from the gamut defining OLEDs in accordance with an in-gamut mixing ratio. Claim 11 has been similarly amended, and to also change "color image signal" to "color display signal", to be consistent with the terminology employed in claim 1 and to provide antecedent basis for such term in dependent claims 12-16.


While Siwinski teaches use of white light emitting OLED elements in a color OLED display, there is no teaching of driving the OLED elements to produce in-gamut colors in a pixel by using a combination of light from the in-gamut OLED element and light from the gamut-specifying OLED elements. Siwinski teaches employing the white light OLED element in power saving modes in place of the colored light emitting elements (e.g., R,G,B elements) only

to display white and shades of gray to provide power savings when displaying images containing a substantial amount of white and/or shades of gray (as suggested, e.g., in paragraphs [0010]-[0014]), or to use the white light elements to display pictorial content in an energy saving monochrome fashion (as suggested, e.g., in paragraphs [0015]-[0016]). These suggestions are different from the present claimed invention wherein in-gamut colors are produced in a pixel using a combination of light from an in-gamut OLED and light from the gamut-specifying OLEDs, and wherein the in-gamut mixing ratio of the OLEDs is selectively controlled to reduce power consumption or increase lifetime of at least one of the OLEDs when employing in-gamut colors. Accordingly, it is clear that Siwinski fails to anticipate or otherwise teach the present invention, and reconsideration of the rejection of such claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 5, 10 and 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. While such claims are believed appropriate in dependent form in view of the arguments regarding claims 1 and 11 above, Claim 5 has additionally been rewritten in independent form as new claim 17.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration of this patent application is respectfully requested. A prompt and favorable action by the Examiner is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe any remaining issues may be resolved via a telephone interview, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' representative at the number below to discuss such issues.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 33,564

Andrew J. Anderson/vjr  
Rochester, NY 14650  
Telephone: (585) 722-9662  
Facsimile: (585) 477-1148

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.